

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| Amanda Murray, |) | C.A. #2:09-1842-PMD-BM |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| Starbucks Corporation d/b/a Starbucks Coffee |) | |
| Company, Starbucks Coffee Company and |) | |
| Starbucks Coffee International, Inc., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

This matter is before the court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that defendant Starbucks Corporation's motion to dismiss and/or strike be denied. The record includes the report and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge made in accordance with this Court's oral Order of Reference and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge's report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). No objections have been filed to the magistrate judge's report.

A review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, it is **ordered** that defendant Starbucks Corporation's motion to dismiss and/or strike is **denied without prejudice** at this time, and plaintiff is ordered to file an amended complaint within twenty (20) days of this Order.

ORDERED, that the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is adopted as the order of this Court, and the case is referred back to Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant for further handling.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.


PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

May 5, 2010
Charleston, South Carolina